

**Advisory Team Meeting
April 25, 2002**

Present: Tom Walther, Tom Kochanski, Scott Schnacky, Jerry Kast, Jack Yates, Alison S. Lebwohl, Mark Wolfgram, John Kinar, Gary Kennedy, Joe Hollister

Facilitating: Claudia Orvis

Unable to attend: Anne Monks, Matt Rauch, Brian Gaber, Mike Ostrenga

Topic	Discussion
Advisory Team Feedback	<p>This discussion was facilitated by Claudia, with Alison out of the room. It focused on the experience during the pilot of serving on the Advisory Team. Major points included:</p> <p>Clear expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clear expectations. ○ Goal was established and accomplished: Team established direction for pilot program. <p>Safe and open environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Everyone had a voice and felt heard. The environment created was a safe one in which to express views, knowledge and lack of knowledge. ○ Continue ensuring critical perspectives, so different alternatives are considered. <p>Program staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dedication of a full-time position to this program was critical to the team's success. ○ Successful skills of program manager: organizational (pulling the meetings together), communication (broad sharing of information, being the mouthpiece of the A-Team in the larger community, ongoing communication with team), energy and enthusiasm, statistical skills, open to change/ flexible. <p>Being on the team was a positive experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Team had a lot of energy and enthusiasm for this effort, because of their sense of accomplishment. ○ Early momentum didn't dissipate. A vision that was established early that people felt was clear enough. People had a common vision. ○ Been able to accomplish a lot in less than a year. ○ The team worked well together. ○ Team members gained better understanding of challenges and environment faced by folks elsewhere in the organization. <p>Meeting structure and frequency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Frequency of meetings was about right. People didn't lose momentum or vision. ○ Meetings were well-prepared for, with full agendas. ○ The meetings were structured to keep us focused, with clear

	<p>objectives and agendas, and we accomplished those objectives, while having fun; then there was good, successful follow-through in the actual program.</p> <p>Team composition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ People were pulled in as needed, to offer expertise and resources. ○ Good structure. Size of group; cross-representation; north/south; urban/rural. ○ Current group wants to stay until full implementation, but then bring other people on, including people in the field: patrolmen; area assistants. ○ Change of team members should happen through rotation, not all at once. ○ Representation from different levels of the organization helped with buy in throughout the organization. <p>Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Build in occasional check-in to make sure team is getting what they need from the program; and program is getting what it needs from the team. <p>Communication with peers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Good information sharing: Joe summarized meeting and sent to colleagues. <p>Flexibility in decision making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Living program. ○ Opportunities to brainstorm. ○ No one dug in their heels. People were passionate, but they listened and compromised as well. ○ Liked: 80% rule for decision-making. We can always come back and revise.
<p>Pilot Feedback</p>	<p>Team composition & roles: what worked</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Standards Team meetings were facilitated by BHO folks with policy expertise in that area. ● Teams had statewide representation: urban/rural; north/south. ● People doing the work set the standards. ● Everyone had their own task. A-Team did its work. S-Team did its own work. ● Positive leadership at the district level. <p>Communication: what worked</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Emphasize flexibility and feedback. People felt heard because of feedback sessions. (Bringing ratings team in to talk to each other; revising program accordingly.) ● Superintendents & area assistants are key: have them involved; keep talking to them. Share results. <p>Communication recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● More tailored communication, esp. to patrol sup's and AA's. ● Meet with key groups to update them on process/ status/

	<p>outcomes of project.</p> <p>Decision-making: what worked</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-making success: use consensus; 80% rule. • Flexibility: We were willing to consider using current data, rather than rating. • Train-the-trainer was good. Resulted in good training. People felt prepared when they went out. <p>Location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Run pilot with one county from each district, but not the same county as in the initial pilot. <p>Timing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more time (than 3 weeks) to do pilot ratings. • Stay flexible on time of year • Short time-frame was helpful, but keep it scheduled and predictable. 6 months was good. <p>Program Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WisDOT should use data to move from advisory role to create clear expectations for county operations based on data.
<p>Communications update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New brochure gives overview of program, shows that people throughout the organization were involved and buy in. • Video shows to DTD management shows the same thing. Will be revised into three videos: one for training; one for upper-level mgmt overview; one for front-line overview. • Gary K. spoke at commissioners training and will speak at the summer mtg. SPO Managers speaking at committee meetings. • Website running on extranet. County folks will get on and test. <p>Task: Alison will send info. on extranet to county folks. Gary K, Tom W, Jack and Jerry will test site and provide feedback.</p>
<p>Feedback on video</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would like to have more comments from the Ratings Team ○ More front line employees ○ Didn't hear the word "county" too often.
<p>Customer survey and performance measures</p>	<p>Two handouts distributed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We've been very happy with Matt's performance • He's looking at ways of revising the customer survey to give us better information on customer importance. Those recommendations are included in one handout. • He's working on performance measures for Compass. These will tell us how Compass is performing (vs. how Compass can be used to measure the performance of other areas). Preliminary thoughts in this area are included on the second handout.

<p>Measure testing & data modeling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alison is currently working on a proposal to bring together a small working group to discuss business needs for the model that rolls up the road ratings and feature weights into grades and priorities. This group would then also conceptually reorganize the model. This work is being done in conjunction with Professor Teresa Adams from the MRUTC, who will be working with Compass on data modeling and measures for 1/12 of FY03.
<p>SWOT analysis: High priority action areas</p>	<p>The group brainstormed strengths, weaknesses (limitations), opportunities and threats, categorized these under subject headings, then selected its top priorities for action. Those are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Understand required resources for rolling out a successful program. Review regularly in relationship to available resources. Clear, accurate analysis of data. Identify effective use of information and establish communication strategies. Increase involvement Continue strategies to garner buy-in/support from all levels, including clarifying timeline for expectations, and emphasizing positive outcomes of pilot.
<p>Medium priority action areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand the program. This was a priority, but not as high as the others. The team agreed that if this needs to be delayed in order to succeed at the other areas, it should be. Ensure consistent cultivation of leadership support. The team agreed that leadership is currently supportive and should continue to be communicated with, but that it is more critical to focus resources on gaining buy-in throughout the organization, rather than at the top.
<p>Lower priority action areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop strategies to leverage resources from other areas., including maximizing use of BHO staff. Understand what initiatives are out there and develop symbiotic relationships. Leverage current budget realities to market Compass. Market/communicate positive outcomes (e.g., strengthening county/WisDOT relationship) Continue resource allocation to support program.
<p>All comments: threats (external: things that may stand in our way)</p>	<p>Resource/Budget concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available IT resources Budget restrictions Extra workload with same staff levels Increased resourced needed as program expands to other areas Travel restrictions <p>Changes/Attitudes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change is heard Area assistants don't have clear picture/understanding of program

	<p>purpose or process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attitude: “What’s wrong with the old way?” ○ Perception of Compass as getting unmerited “special treatment.” ○ Resistance to change. <p>Confusing data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Large amount of data that needs to be made into information. ○ If results of ratings are not easily understood and meaningful, the program will die. ○ Data interpreted correctly by others ○ Have not yet assured that collected data will all be in a useable format. <p>Fear of death: program goes dead in a few years</p> <p>Momentum: Need to keep project moving forward (i.e., winter, waysides, bridges)</p> <p>Conflicting priorities: Other management priorities</p> <p>Top management support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Change in DOT secretary ○ Election-year waffling
<p>All comments: opportunities (external things that may help us)</p>	<p>Symbiosis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DTD focus on resource model and performance measures ○ Other areas are interested in performance measures <p>Broader measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New winter standards ○ Bring in additional categories <p>Other states</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Peers in other states <p>Information building to external interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Better understanding of what we do ○ Better data for legislative decisions ○ Be realistic and clear about what/when to avoid unrealistic expectations. <p>Budget/funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Budget crisis highlights need for priorities ○ Current budget malaise may actually help sell program ○ Budget concerns: strive for priorities & efficiencies ○ Improved allocation of resources
<p>All comments: weaknesses (internal limitations)</p>	<p>Geography</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Spread-out organization ○ Large number of staff needed to ensure implementation (72 superintendents and 25+ area assistants) <p>Limited knowledge of program in DOT</p> <p>Staffing limitations: small staff for Compass</p> <p>Ghosts: past history of DOT</p> <p>Buy-in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Could get more input/involvement from more people

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need to start involving other people ○ Don't have buy-in from all districts ○ DTD: "Show me the money" ○ Only 8 counties have participated so far
Strengths (internal: things about the program that can help us succeed.)	<p>Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Great Advisory Team ○ Good spokespeople ○ Many leaders to tap moving forward ○ Dave Vieth ○ Details of the program are being build by those most affected ○ Great program leadership <p>Partnership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Counties can use program to better maintenance program ○ Consistency of maintenance should be improved ○ Improved working relationships between DOT and counties <p>Positive outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ History of action ○ Have successfully completed a pilot effort ○ Information gained so far is positive ○ Emphasize successes so far ○ Work done so far has been positively received <p>Resources: We have the resources necessary to succeed.</p> <p>Buy in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Management buy in ○ So far, lots of buy in ○ Already have a lot of input from different levels of DOT: county, etc. ○ Growing buy in
Next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alison types up notes and sends to group. ○ John, Scott, Mark, Dave, Alison create action plan for top priorities. Alison schedules meeting. ○ Alison sends action plan to group with recommendation for follow-up format (teleconference, meeting, etc)
Notes on new elements	<p>Things to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Which ones? Winter, bridges, rest areas? ● What criteria to use to select? ● Criteria could include: Timing/ record of success/ likelihood of success/ \$\$\$'s ● Possibility of doing ratings in the spring. <p>Notes on winter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordinate with new guidelines ○ Include snowplow operators on team ○ Will need to address union issues